UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,331	04/18/2001	Dhananjay A. Nagalkar	P 275029 P10780	8298

909   7590   08/28/2003

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	2

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 April 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable

over Mukherjee et al., U.S. Patent 5,311,424 (hereinafter referred to as Mukherjee) in

view of Gregory et al., U.S. Patent 6,182,246 (hereinafter referred to as Gregory).

In regard to claim 1, Mukherjee discloses a content management system:

"A central site for supporting a generic product with a plurality of features;"

Mukherjee discloses a central site supporting a generic product with a plurality of

features including a visual tool (column 2, lines 56 – 64).

"At least one development site connecting to the central site ... testing said

customized product, and maintaining said customized product at said central site."

Mukherjee discloses at least one development site for groups of developers to

communicate with a central site running a customization process based of the plurality of

features, maintained on the central site (column 5, lines 7 – 22).   Mukherjee does not

disclose testing of the customized product at the central site.   However, Gregory discloses

a software testing system on a host computer (Abstract, e.g., Figure 6).   Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the content management system as taught by Mukherjee with the testing feature

of the Gregory invention, because it would be advantageous to test the customized

product at the central site where it could be modified before deployment.

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"A run time engine for performing the plurality of features of the generic

product;" Mukherjee does not teach a run-time engine. However, Gregory teaches a

run-time engine (an engine running test configurations), in order to apply features from a

generic file (executing options on a test suite; column 7, lines 25 – 49). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine a run-time engine as taught by Gregory to the content management system of

Mukherjee, because the run-time engine would allow the plurality of features at the

central site to be properly configured and tested before downloading to the development

site.

"A visual customization tool for interfacing with the at least one development

site..." Mukherjee does not teach a visual customization tool. However, Gregory

teaches a graphical user interface "wizard" to relay information and error messages

(column 7, lines 40 – 43; column 8, lines 3 - 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include visual builder (GUI

interface "wizard") as taught by Gregory into the Mukherjee system, because the visual

tool offers the advantage of reducing programming time and errors when customizing and

testing components with the run-time engine before they are installed on the target

system.

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"...each of the plurality of features corresponds to a defined interface which can be invoked from the visual customization tool." Mukherjee does not teach invoking features from a visual customization tool. However, Gregory teaches visual editing of properties allowing the user to simulate a variety of scenarios (column 8, lines 10 – 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to add the GUI "wizard" as taught by Gregory, because the "wizard" offers the advantage of visually combining desired components available in the Mukhrtjee system for the customization, thus reducing development time, and reducing errors.

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"A test driver tool for triggering the runtime engine to perform a test on the customized product;"

"A visual log viewer for visually viewing debug data generated by the run-time engine during the test on the customized product."

Mukherjee does not teach a test driver tool to trigger a run time engine or a log viewer. However, Gregory teaches a user interface to provide information triggering the run-time engine and a log viewer to view and maintain log data (column 3, lines 14 – 50; e.g., Figure 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a test driver and a log viewer as taught by Gregory to the content management system of Mukherjee, because it provides a means to initiate the runtime engine of the Gregory invention and view the resulting log information, useful

for debugging purposes, and further provides a means for a user to take corrective action

based on the log information.

In regard to claim 6:

Claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claim 15 (a computer-readable medium encoded with a program), it

is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 6 (a

method).

3.   Claims 4, 11 – 14, and 16 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mukherjee et al., U.S. Patent 5,311,424 (hereinafter referred to as

Mukherjee) in view of Gregory et al., U.S. Patent 6,182,246 (hereinafter referred to as

Gregory), and further in view of Lewallen, U.S. Patent 6,385,769, and further in view of

Cleaveland et al., U.S. Patent 6,385,765 (hereinafter referred to as Cleaveland).

In regard to claim 4, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"A parameter module generator for activating a portion of the plurality of

features with custom values...;" Neither Mukherjee nor Gregory teaches a parameter

generation module with custom values. However, Lewallen teaches the generation of a

plurality of custom features (column 8, lines 41 – 51; e.g., Figure 2). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

a run-time engine as taught by Gregory with the content management system of

Mukherjee so that the content at the development site might be properly configured with

information received from the central site, and further including a parameter generation

module as taught by Lewallen, because this module allows customized components to be

generated and tested with the run-time engine of Gregory before deployment.

"A visual diagram generator for configuring the portion of features that are

activated through the activating by the parameter module..." Neither Mukherjee nor

Gregory teaches a visual diagram generator. However, Cleaveland discloses a visual

diagram generator (e.g., Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled

in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the content management system

of Mukherjee with the testing feature of Gregory so that the content at the development

site might be properly configured from with information received from the central site,

and further modified by including graphical information as taught by Cleaveland, because

of the advantage of capturing some system features graphically and improving the

efficiency of the system designers.

In regard to claim 11, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

"Selecting a portion of the plurality of features of the generic product;"

Mukherjee discloses a central site supporting a generic product with a plurality of

features including a visual tool (column 2, lines 56 – 64).

"Specifying custom values for the portion of the plurality of features;"

Mukherjee discloses the specification of a custom product with a plurality of custom

features (column 6, lines 7 – 33).

"Generating a parameter module based on the portion of the plurality

features...;" Neither Mukherjee nor Gregory teaches a parameter generation module.

However, Lewallen teaches the generation of a plurality of custom component features

(column 8, lines 41 – 51; e.g., Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the content management

system of Mukherjee with the testing feature of Gregory so that the content at the

development site might be properly configured from the information received from the

generic central site, and modified by a parameter generation module as taught by

Lewallen because this module allows components to be generated, customized and tested

with predefined parameters before deployment.

"Constructing a visual diagram...to form a state machine." Neither Mukherjee

nor Gregory teaches the construction of a visual diagram to form a state machine.

However, Cleaveland discloses the specification of a hierarchical structure with a

graphical coordination language to specify a state machine that is input with textual

information to verify a system (column 2, lines 53 – 65; column 3, lines 16 – 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the content management system of Mukherjee with the testing

feature of Gregory so that the content at the development site might be properly

configured from with information received from the central site, and further modified by

including graphical information specifying a state machine as taught by Cleaveland,

because of the advantage of capturing some system features graphically and improving

the efficiency of the system designers.

In regard to claim 12, incorporating the rejection of claim 11:

" The selecting is performed via a parameter module generator in a

customization tool; "

"The specifying is performed through defined interfaces...; "

Neither Mukherjee nor Gregory teaches a parameter module generator or

specifying through defined interfaces of the parameter module. However, Lewallen

teaches the generation of a plurality of custom component features and interfaces

(column 8, lines 41 – 51; e.g., Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the content management

system of Mukherjee with the testing feature of Gregory so that the content at the

development site might be properly configured with information received from the

central site, and modified by a parameter generation module as taught by Lewallen,

because this modification allows components to be customized and tested with

predefined parameters before deployment.

"The constructing is performed via a visual diagram generator... " Neither

Mukherjee nor Gregory teaches the generation of a visual diagram. However, Cleaveland

discloses a visual diagram generator (e.g., Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

content management system of Mukherjee with the testing feature of Gregory so that the

content at the development site might be properly configured from with information

received from the central site, and further modified by including graphical information as

taught by Cleaveland, because of the advantage of capturing some system features

graphically and improving the efficiency of the system designers.

In regard to claim 13, incorporating the rejection of claim 11:

"Triggering...a run-time engine at the central site...;" Mukherjee does not teach a test driver tool to trigger a run time engine or a log viewer. However, Gregory teaches a user interface to provide information triggering the run-time engine and a log viewer to view and maintain log data (column 3, lines 14 – 50; e.g., Figure 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a test driver and a log viewer as taught by Gregory to the content management system of Mukherjee, because it provides a means to initiate the runtime engine of the Gregory invention and view the resulting log information, useful for debugging purposes, and further provides a means for a user to take corrective action based on the log information.

"Executing, by the run time engine, the customized product based on the parameter module and the visual diagram." Mukherjee does not teach the execution of the customized product with a run-time engine. However, Gregory executes test suites via the run-time engine based on selected information and settings (parameters) when executing a test run (column 8, lines 3 – 16; column 3, lines 14 – 50; e.g., Figure 6), and Cleaveland simulates a system based on textual and visual diagrams (e.g., Figures 1 and 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the content management system of Mukherjee with the testing feature of Gregory so that the customized content at the development site might be properly configured from the information received from the central site, including graphical information as taught by Cleaveland, because of the advantage of controlling

the execution process and capturing some features graphically thus improving the

efficiency of the system designers.

In regard to claim 14, incorporating the rejection of claim 13:

"Generating, by the run-time engine, debug data based on the executing the

customized product;"

"Displaying the debug data on a visual log viewer;"

"Debugging..."

Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 5.

In regard to claim 16 (a computer-readable medium encoded with a program), it

is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 11 (a

method).

In regard to claim 17 (a computer-readable medium encoded with a program), it

is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 13(a

method).

In regard to claim 18 (a computer-readable medium encoded with a program), it

is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 14 (a

method).

4.   Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable over
Mukherjee et al., U.S. Patent 5,311,424 (hereinafter referred to as Mukherjee) in view of
Gregory et al., U.S. Patent 6,182,246 (hereinafter referred to as Gregory) as applied to
claim 6 above, and further in view of Alexander et al., U.S. Patent 5,986,654 (hereinafter
referred to as Alexander).

> **In regard to claims 7 and 9**, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:
>
> *"...the generic product includes a web site."*
>
> *"...the customized product includes a customized web site."*
>
> Neither Mukherjee nor Gregory teaches that the managed content is a web page as
either a generic product or a customized product. However, Alexander does disclose a
means to customize a generic web page (column 16, lines 7 – 21). Therefore, it would
have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine
the content management system of Mukherjee with the testing facility of Gregory so that
the content at the development site might be properly configured from the information
received from the generic central site, and further combined with the Alexander invention
supplying a generic web page as a product to be customized. Because of the ubiquitous
nature of the Internet, it would be reasonable to provide web pages as a managed product
available in the Mukherjee system.

5.   Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable over
Mukherjee et al., U.S. Patent 5,311,424 (hereinafter referred to as Mukherjee) in view of
Gregory et al., U.S. Patent 6,182,246 (hereinafter referred to as Gregory) as applied to

claim 6 above, and further in view of Elrod et al., U.S. Patent 5,455,852 (hereinafter

referred to as Elrod).

In regard to claims 8 and 10, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

"...the generic product includes a protocol."

"...the customized product includes a variant of a protocol."

Neither Mukherjee nor Gregory teaches that the managed content is a protocol as

either a generic product or a customized product. However, Elrod does disclose a means

to customize a protocol (column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 9). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

content management system of Mukherjee with the testing facility of Gregory so that the

content at the development site might be properly configured from the information

received from the generic central site, and further combined with the Elrod invention

supplying a generic protocol as a product, because the needs of a particular development

site may be satisfied by having the ability to customize a particular protocol for a specific

processes or a unique standards requirement .

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 5,907,550 to Hontz, regarding triggering a run-time engine and

logging test data.

U.S. Patent 6,049,882 to Mittal, regarding creation of object models with a run-time engine.

U.S. Patent 6,344,859 to Alimpich et al., regarding a display system with a plurality of selectable base function interfaces for the control of functions.

U.S. Patent 6,407,761 to Ching et al., regarding visual customization of business object interfaces.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

August 7, 2003

JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124